## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action dated march 9, 2009. Claims 1-27 are pending and stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1- 27 have been amended.

The rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement, is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner asserted that the specification does not provide support for the limitation "said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry is reduced by a predetermined rate when said difference length exists, regardless of the direction in the change of the speed of the player character in the game space". More specifically, the Examiner stated that "none of the disclosure provided by the applicant discloses the change in direction as claimed, specifically the applicant has not described the change in the reverse direction-how one would be able to update the point-of-regard location when the player character moves in the reverse direction toward the camera location".

It is submitted that the claimed "direction" refers to the "change of the speed of the player character in the game space", and does not refer to a change in the direction of movement of the player character. In other words, "direction in the change of the speed of the player character" refers to whether the speed increases or decreases. Support for this can be found, for example, in Fig. 5 and in the Abstract ("the virtual camera follows the player character from behind after some delay"). Further support for this limitation can also be found, in p. 26, line 24 to p. 27, line 3 of the specification (the virtual camera approaches a game character whose speed increases), and in p. 24, lines 9-11 ("after the third frame, too, similarly, the updating process of the camera

location is repeated, and the virtual camera 84 gradually comes close to the stopping (stationary) player character 82") (the virtual camera approaches a game character whose speed decreases).

In addition, the Examiner asserted that there is no support "of how the difference length calculated is reduced when the player character is moving", see p. 4 of the Office Action. Applicant submits that, for example, Fig. 6, shows the game character moving (as represented by the "cross" symbol). The game character is moved between the 0-th frame and the 2nd frame. Corresponding to this movement, the difference length is reduced from Δd1 to Δd12'.

Finally, the Examiner asserted that the specification lacks support for the limitation of claim 27 "said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry is reduced by a predetermined rate when said difference length exists, when the speed of the player character increases". Applicant points the Examiner's attention to p. 26, line 24 to p. 27, line 3 ("Furthermore, as the case shown in Fig. 6, in a case that the player character 82 continues moving, there is a case that if a moving speed of the player character 82 is too fast, *even if the point-of-regard location is brought closer at the predetermined ratio*, the virtual camera 84 can not follow in a timely manner, and therefore, the player character 82 deviates from the game screen"), emphasis added. From the above, it is clear that the specification discloses that the virtual camera follows the player character even if the player character increases its speed.

The rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, it is submitted that the claimed "direction" refers to the "change of the speed of the player character in the game space", therefore the limitation "said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry is reduced by

a predetermined rate when said difference length exists, regardless of the direction in the change of the speed of the player character in the game space" is drawn to the difference being reduced regardless as to whether the speed of the player character increases or decreases. Support for this limitation can be found, as discussed above, in p. 26, line 24 to p. 27, line 3 of the specification (the virtual camera approaches a game character whose speed increases), and in p. 24, lines 9-11 ("after the third frame, too, similarly, the updating process of the camera location is repeated, and the virtual camera 84 gradually comes close to the stopping (stationary) player character 82") (the virtual camera approaches a game character whose speed decreases).

The rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27, for lack of antecedent basis. Applicant has made the appropriate changes to overcome this rejection.

Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, because allegedly the limitation "regardless of the direction in the change of the speed of the player character in the game space" is not clear. As we discussed above, it is submitted that the above limitation refers to a change of the speed of the player towards a higher or a lower value and does not refer to a "positional" direction of the player character.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Mizumoto (US 6,409,597) is respectfully traversed.

Mizumoto fails to disclose or even remotely suggest each and every limitation set forth in the claim. Anticipation requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found,

either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference", *Verdegaal Bro. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (MPEP § 2131).

Amended claim 1 now recites "a virtual-camera-location updating programmed logic circuitry for updating at said intervals of said predetermined number of frames in order said location of said virtual camera in such a manner that said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry *is reduced by a predetermined ratio of the difference length calculated at the previous interval* when said difference length exists, regardless of the direction in a change of the speed of the player character in the game space". Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in Fig. 6 of the instant specification. Mizumoto fails to teach or suggest this feature.

With the above amendment, it is made clear that in the game system of claim 1, the distance between a target and a virtual camera is adjusted at a predetermined ratio based on a distance that is dynamically changed due to movement of a player character. For example, as shown on Fig. 6 of the instant specification, after the player character has moved a distance Δd1 away from the virtual camera, the virtual camera moves closer to the player character so that the new difference between the position of the player character and the virtual camera is 80% of the original difference. If the player character moves again to a new position, then the virtual camera moves closer to the player character, so that the new difference between the position of the player character and the virtual camera Δd12' is 80% of the previous difference Δd12. In other words, as the player character moves away from the virtual camera, **the position of the virtual camera changes based on the dynamically changing position of the player character**.

In contrast, Mizumoto discloses automatically changing from one viewpoint provided by a virtual camera to another, based on a certain condition being satisfied, at a **constant** predetermined moving speed MS for that condition. Every time a condition is satisfied, the distance of the view may be reduced from the current location merely by reduction or subtraction at a **fixed** value. Even though the virtual camera may get closer to the player character (e.g., if the car crashes, the camera will move to point P1, which is 0 points away from the car), this is not done so that at each frame the virtual camera is closer to the car at a predetermined ratio of the previous distance depending on the dynamically changing position of the car. For example, in Mizumoto, if none of the enumerated conditions occurs, then the virtual camera is positioned at the default point P3, 200 points behind the car, i.e., the virtual camera does not gradually get closer to the car.

With the above amendment, it is made clear that during each updating of the difference length, the difference length is reduced by a predetermined ratio (e.g., 20%) of the value calculated at the previous interval. In contrast, in Mizumoto, the decrease in the length (if it occurs) is fixed and depends on the specific condition, e.g., whether the car crashed, spun, etc.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 include limitations similar to claim 1 and are also allowable.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, all dependent from claim 1, or 8, or 15, or 17, or 19, or 21, or 23, or 25 be also withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: /Leonidas Boutsikaris/
Leonidas Boutsikaris
Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100